



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,536	08/31/2001	Lee C. Moore	D/A0A45	3291

7590 04/23/2003

Patrick R. Roche, Esq.  
Fay, Sharpe, Fagan, Minnich & McKee, LLP  
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor  
Cleveland, OH 44114-2518

EXAMINER

KOYAMA, KUMIKO C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2876	

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/944,536

Applicant(s)

MOORE, LEE C. *IV*

Examiner

Kumiko C. Koyama

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 February 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgement is made of receipt of Amendment filed on February 03, 2003.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 1-3, 8 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kubota (US 6,041,323).

Kubota teaches an information search method including a “division information in document” which is typically a delimiter in a sentence such as “.” or “;”, “Chapter 1”, “Summary”, a blank line or a blank character(s) (col 19, lines 15-19). The document may be divided into blocks by detecting line feed, a period, punctuation, “Chapter X”, or “Section X”, detecting a blank line, or detecting the paragraph number in a patent specification, or a certain number of characters may be incorporated as one block (col 20, lines 19-24). These blocks are assigned a series of numbers of block numbers. A specially defined delimiter pattern is stored together with the document number of the document and the position information in the document for characters at the boundaries of blocks. The division information, which is considered to be a table of contents, is stored in the index files (col 20, lines 15-28). Kubota teaches that the created index files are displayed (Fig. 11).

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota in view of Shiiyama (US 5,905,811). The teachings of Kubota have been discussed above.

Kubota teaches locating a document of interest from a set of electronic document texts and searching the document (col 1, lines 8-22).

Kubota fails to teach scanning a printed version of the document to generate scan data, performing one of optical character recognition functions and document recognition functions on the scan data to generate an electronic version of the document. Kubota also fails to teach selecting an exemplary sub-section title, performing one of document recognition and optical character recognition on the selected exemplary sub-section title, and using at least one recognized property of the exemplary sub-section title as a subsection delimiter definition.

Shiiyama discloses an image scanner 1 is image input means for optically reading out an original image of a document and an image data (col 2 lines 3-5, lines 44-46). Shiiyama also discloses an OCR function in order convert the inputted image information to a text (col 1 lines 7-9). Shiiyama teaches searching the data for one of characters (col 2 lines 60-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Shiiyama to the teachings of Kubota in

order to create an electronic version of the document so that the user can easily locate the searching topic and also make the search faster by inputting the electronic version into a computer and having the computer do the search.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota in view of Kujiraoka (US 5,845,305).

Kubota teaches that the created index files are displayed (Fig. 11).

Kubota fails to checking that the displayed index is correct and correcting the index.

Kujiraoka teaches to inspect whether or no the index word is appropriate (col 3 line 9-10) and display control means comprising editing means for editing the reading of the index word.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Kujiraoka to the teachings of Kubota in order to confirm that the inputted index is correct and avoid any mistakes to the indexing system, which will lead to a quicker and faster searching system.

6. Claims 9-13 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota in view of Shiiyama.

Re claim 9, 18 and 20: Kubota teaches an information search method including a “division information in document” which is typically a delimiter in a sentence such as “.” or “,”, “Chapter 1”, “Summary”, a blank line or a blank character(s) (col 19, lines 15-19). The document may be divided into blocks by detecting line feed, a period, punctuation, “Chapter X”, or “Section X”, detecting a blank line, or detecting the paragraph number in a patent specification, or a certain number of characters may be incorporated as one block (col 20, lines 19-24). These blocks are assigned a series of numbers of block numbers. A specially defined

delimiter pattern is stored together with the document number of the document and the position information in the document for characters at the boundaries of blocks. The division information is stored in the index files (col 20, lines 15-28). Kubota teaches that the created index files are displayed (Fig. 11). Kubota also teaches a storage medium including a floppy disk, a CD-ROM, an MO, a PD or a storage device connected to a network (col 7, lines 65+).

Shiiyama discloses an image scanner 1 is image input means for optically reading out an original image of a document and an image data (col 2 lines 3-5, lines 44-46). Shiiyama also discloses an OCR function in order convert the inputted image information to a text (col 1 lines 7-9). Shiiyama teaches searching the data for one of characters (col 2 lines 60-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Shiiyama to the teachings of Kubota in order to create an electronic version of the document so that the user can easily locate the searching topic and also make the search faster by inputting the electronic version into a computer and having the computer do the search.

Re claim 10 and 11: Kubota further teaches a display (col 8, lines 55+), which is a user interface displaying information transferred from the computer/document processor to the user/document processor operator. Kubota also teaches a keyboard 106 for key inputting a command or a character string to be searched (col 8, lines 55+) that serves as a delimiter designator module operative to communicate with the document process operator through the user interface (by displaying information inputted etc.) in order to generate at least one delimiter designation.

Re claim 12 , 13 and 19: Kubota, in addition to above, further that the search character input module 210 preferably consists of a dialog box in the multiwindow environment, where the desired character(s) to be searched is input through the keyboard 106 and displayed in the input box. The titles of input documents are displayed on the display screen (col 10, lines 29-48).

7. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota as modified by Shiiyama as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Knowles (US 6,345,764). The teachings of Kubota as modified by Shiiyama have been discussed above.

Kubota as modified by Shiiyama fails to teach that the delimiter searcher is operative to search for a defined delimiter comprising a symbol selected from a barcode and a data glyph.

Knowles teaches a document containing barcodes (Fig. 1A).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the teachings of Knowles to the teachings of Kubota as modified by Shiiyama because a reader may be trying to retrieve or searching for a collection of barcode or information contained in a barcode, which simplifies the users search because barcodes can be scanned instantaneously and directly leads to the precise information source.

8. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota as modified by Shiiyama as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Schmidt et al (US 4,903,229). The teachings of Kubota as modified by Shiiyama have been discussed above.

Kubota as modified by Shiiyama fail to teach that the print engine comprises a xerographic printer.

Schmidt teaches a forms generating and information retrieval system utilizing a xerographic print engine 24 (col 2 line 34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Schmidt to the teachings of Kubota as modified by Shiiyama because the xerographic print engine generates forms and inures the benefits of graphic reproduction.

9. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota as modified by Shiiyama and Schmidt as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Herregods et al (US 6,064,397).

Kubota as modified by Shiiyama and Schmidt fail to teach that the print engine comprises an inkjet printer.

Herregods teaches that a printer can be a inkjet printer (col 1 line 42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Herregods to the teachings of Kubota as modified by Shiiyama and Schmidt because an inkjet printer can provide a reproduction of colored document, therefore it can provide a more precise reproduction of the document when the document includes colored features.

#### *Response to Arguments*

10. Applicant's arguments, see page 9+, filed February 03, 2003, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1,9 and 18 under 35 USC 102(b) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Kubota, Shiiyama, Schmidt, Kujiraoka, Knowles and Herregods.

*Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kumiko C. Koyama whose telephone number is 703-305-5425. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on 703-305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

kck  
April 18, 2003



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Karl D. Frech".

KARL D. FRECH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER